

silicate; and foamed or solid glass or organic polymer
particles; and

A / cont
Suz
(c) ~~X9~~ a resinous bond in which the particles are mounted and held.

Please delete Claim 7.

In Claim 8, line 1, delete "7" and substitute ---1---.

In Claim 10, line 4, please delete "100" and substitute
---95---

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above application, in view of the above amendments and the remarks hereinafter presented, is respectfully requested.

The amendments now made have the purpose of clarifying the distinction between the present application and the recently allowed U. S. Application Serial No. 07/406,487 which is a parent to the present case.

The amendments clarify that the claimed compositions also comprise at least a second kind of abrasive particle other than the sintered sol gel alumina particles recited in the claim as filed. This is clearly intended as is demonstrated by Claim 5.

The amendments also introduce into Claim 1 the feature of Claim 7 to parallel a similar amendment made in the parent.

It is submitted, therefore, that no new matter is introduced by these amendments.

THE REJECTION

The claims presently stand rejected over U.S. Patent 4,997,461 (Markhoff-Matheny et al.) considered with U.S. Patent 4,898,597 (Hay et al.).

It is pointed out in response that not only does Markhoff-Matheny et al. fail to disclose the presence of friable filler particles (and certainly not those now specified), but it also relates to vitreously bonded products, whereas the present application relates to resinous bonded products. This is a major technology difference that makes any argument based thereon immediately suspect.

The secondary reference (Hay et al.) also deals with vitreously bonded wheels with the emphasis on the use of a frit bond. The "filler or grinding aid" referred to in the passage identified by the Examiner, is a material that, under grinding conditions, reacts with the metal surface to facilitate the metal removal. This is often done by release of a chemical such as a halogen or a hydrochloric acid which is believed to react chemically with the metal. This action is clearly not that of the friable fillers used in the present invention.

It is believed that the present invention is clearly distinguished over the cited art and totally unobvious over it. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 103 and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is, therefore, earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



David Bennett
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 28,821